

## REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed June 28, 2007 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 54, 55 and 56 have been amended. Claims 29-56 are now pending. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks provided herein below and withdrawal of the present rejections are respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 29-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action states that “the local processor” should be changed to “a local processor.”

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claims as suggested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 29-31, 34-37, 40-43, 46-49 and 52-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mito et al. On page 10 of the Office Action, claims 35, 38-40, 47, 50-52, 54 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanrahan. On page 15 of the Office Action, claims 29-34, 36, 37, 41-46, 48, 49, 53 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanrahan in view of Kahle.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. The independent claims recite a processor interface is monitored to identify processor status for determining a time to perform a received error recovery instruction for withholding access to a local processor.

The Office Action states the Mito discloses monitoring a processor interface, i.e., monitoring a bus for interrupts received from a power management processor. However, the bus monitored by Mito is not equivalent to the processor interface recited in the independent claims. For example, a processor interface according to embodiments of the present invention includes

logic that actively participates in operations on the processor interface. Moreover, the logic of the processor interface is described as being the most important to be at a known good state since it is involved in all accesses of the system by the local processor. In addition, the simple monitoring of a bus as described by Mito et al. does not enable a determination of a time to perform an error recovery instruction by withholding access to a local processor.

Clearly, monitoring the processor interface recited in the claims is different than simply monitoring a bus for an interrupt as described by Mito et al.

Hanrahan fails to overcome the deficiencies of Mito et al. Hanrahan also merely describes monitoring a bus. In addition, Hanrahan discloses the use of a bus arbiter that uses a LRU algorithm to control access to the bus. Nevertheless, Hanrahan fails to disclose, teach or suggest monitoring a processor interface according to embodiments of the present invention because the processor interface according to embodiments of the present invention includes logic that actively participates in operations on the processor interface, not just providing access control to a bus. Moreover, the monitoring of the processor interface recited in the claims involves the processor interface determining a time to perform an error recovery instruction by withholding access to a local processor.

Accordingly, Mito et al. and Hanrahan fail to disclose, teach or suggest embodiments of the present recited in the independent claims.

Kahle et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies of Mito et al. and Hanrahan. Kahle et al. merely describes a hang detection unit. As with Hanrahan et al., Kahle et al. fails to suggest monitoring a processor interface to identify processor status for determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction. Kahle et al. also fails to suggest determining a time to perform the error recovery instruction for withholding access to the local processor. Further, Kahle et al. also fails to suggest performing the error recovery instruction for withholding access to the local

processor when the monitoring determines a time for performing the error recovery instruction.

The Office Action also admits that Hanrahan et al. fails to disclose beginning a timeout task.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit Mito et al., Hanrahan, and Kahle, alone or in combination fail to teach, disclose or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in independent claims 29, 35, 41, 47 and 53-56.

Dependent claims 30-34, 36-40, 42-46 and 48-52 are also patentable over the cited reference, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 29, 35, 41 and 47, respectively. Further dependent claims 30-34, 36-40, 42-46 and 48-52 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 30-34, 36-40, 42-46 and 48-52 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel  
1000 Tallan Building  
Two Union Square  
Chattanooga, TN 37402  
423-757-0264

By:   
Name: David W. Lynch  
Reg. No.: 36,204